



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,636	09/08/2003	Frank C. Nicholas	7710/10	2816

7590
FRANK C. NICHOLAS
CARDINAL LAW GROUP
Suite 2000
1603 Orrington Avenue
Evanston, IL 60201

EXAMINER

DURAN, ARTHUR D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3622

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/19/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/657,636

Applicant(s)

NICHOLAS ET AL.

Examiner

Arthur Duran

Art Unit

3622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 December 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/22)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 14-20 have been examined.

Response to Amendment

The Amendment filed 12/18/09 on is sufficient to overcome the prior rejection. However, a new rejection has been made.

Election/Restrictions

On 12/18/09 Applicant elected Group III, claims 14-20. See Applicant Remarks dated 12/18/09.

Interview Summary

On 5/17/10, Examiner spoke with Frank Nicholas. Because Applicant elected a new claim set, claims 14-20, on 12/18/09, the Final Action dated 2/22/10 has been vacated and this current action has been resent as a Non-Final on 5/18/10. The current action examines claims 14-20.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 14, and its dependent claims, is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Based on Supreme Court precedent a method claim must (1) be tied to a particular machine or apparatus (see at least *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780, 787-88 (1876)) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or

materials) to a different state or thing (see at least *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 71 (1972)). A method claim that fails to meet one of the above requirements is not in compliance with the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101 for patent eligible subject matter. To correct this issue, the independent claim could be amended such that at least one significant feature (not just data gathering or outputting) of the body of the claims actively uses a technological apparatus (computer, server, processor, etc).

Priority

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

The disclosure of the prior-filed application, Application No. 10/172,492, fails to provide adequate support or enablement in the manner provided by the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for one or more claims of this application. Parent CIP Application 10/172,492 does not disclose any Universal Resource Identifier (URI) or "invitation" as stated in the independent claim. Also, dependent claims 20 "ad wrapper" is not in 10/172,492. Hence, the priority date for the present application does Not benefit from 10/172,492.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 15 and 17 recites the limitation "the price" in "the profile". However, there is no price or profile in parent claim 14. Hence, there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 14, 15, 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta (6487538).

Claim 14. Gupta discloses a method of operating an online target advertising system, the method comprising:

Providing a page specific invitation to advertise link on a web page associated with its identifying universal resource identifier (URI);

Receiving a request to advertise via the link at an ad server;

Displaying an advertisement in an advertisement space on successive web pages having the identified URI, based on the request (11:15-25; 13:10-45; 14:20-35; Fig. 5).

Claim 15. Gupta discloses the method of claim 14 wherein the price to occupy the advertisement space is determined in an ongoing auction (13:10-45).

Claim 19. Gupta discloses the method of claim 14 wherein the ad server is a right of first refusal ad server (Fig. 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 16-18, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta (6487538) in view of Gerace (5,848,396).

Claims 16-18: Gupta does not explicitly disclose, "16. The method of claim 14 further comprising collecting profile information based on the request to advertise.

17. The method of claim 14 wherein the profile information includes the identifying URI and the scanned contents of the web page having the identified URI.

18. The method of claim 14 further comprising providing a suggested URI based on the profile information".

However, Gerace discloses profiling requests to advertise and advertisers (17:50-67; 11"64-12:6) and tracking the page and content where the ad came from (18:50-19:5; 6:55-7:25) and suggesting a URI (19:25-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Gerace's tracking ad requests to Gupta's advertiser with ad requests and better

targeting. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better improve ad targeting.

Claim 20. Gupta does not explicitly disclose wherein the advertisement displayed is selected from a targeted ad wrapper. Applicant's Specification describes targeted ad wrapper at ([174]). Gerace discloses ads as series, campaigns, sets, or packages (12:20-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add Gerace's ad packages to Gupta's numerous ads. One would have been motivated to do this in order to better organize ad campaigns.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Applicant has presented new claims 14-20 for examination. Please see the prior art rejection above.

Conclusion

The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

a) Bell 20040125140 discloses to advertise link on a web page associated with its identifying universal resource identifier (URI) (Figs. 11a, 11b; [88]);

Receiving a request to advertise via the link at an ad server;

Displaying an advertisement in an advertisement space on successive web pages having the identified URI, based on the request (Fig. 11b, item 1112).

b) Slaughter 7370091 discloses relevant features for filling empty ad slots.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arthur Duran whose telephone number is (571)272-6718. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri, 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Arthur Duran
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3622

/Arthur Duran/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3622
5/17/10